

**OPINION 2013 (Case 3173)*****Phrynidium crucigerum* Lichtenstein & Martens, 1856 (currently *Atelopus cruciger*; Amphibia, Anura): specific name conserved by the designation of a neotype**

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Amphibia; Anura; BUFONIDAE; *Atelopus cruciger*; *Atelopus varius*; Venezuela; Neotropics.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) Under the plenary power all previous type fixations for the nominal species *Phrynidium crucigerum* Lichtenstein & Martens, 1856 are hereby set aside and the specimen from the vicinity of Rancho Grande on the road from Maracay to Ocumare de la Costa (ca. 1000 m above sea level), Estado Aragua, Venezuela, ZSM 93/1947/10, Zoologische Staatssammlung, Munich, is designated as the neotype.
- (2) The name *crucigerum* Lichtenstein & Martens, 1856, as published in the binomen *Phrynidium crucigerum* and as defined by the neotype designated in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

An application for the conservation of the specific name of *Phrynidium crucigerum* Lichtenstein & Martens, 1856 by the designation of a neotype was received from Drs Stefan Lötters (*University of Mainz, Mainz, Germany*) and Enrique La Marca (*Universidad de Los Andes, Mérida, Venezuela*) on 4 September 2000. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 58: 119–121 (June 2001). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments on the case were received.

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 March 2002 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 58: 120. At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2002 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 20: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bock, Böhme, Bouchet, Brothers, Calder, Cogger, Eschmeyer, Evenhuis, Fortey, Halliday, Kraus, Macpherson, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Mawatari, Nielsen, Papp, Song, van Tol

Negative votes – 7: Kerzhner, Lamas, Minelli, Ng, Patterson, Rosenberg and Štys.

No vote was received from Dupuis.

Voting against, Ng, Rosenberg and Štys commented that Lötters, Böhme & Günther (1998) accepted the synonymy of the two taxa in question, and their conclusions follow the Code. It is not evident from the application that the names of these frogs have been cited frequently other than in systematic literature. The arguments for the need for a neotype are not very compelling, therefore it would be more logical to accept the synonymy and apply a new name for the Venezuelan species.

**Original reference**

The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*crucigerum*, *Phrynidium*, Lichtenstein & Martens, 1856, *Nomenclator reptilium et amphibiorum musei zoologici berlinensis*, p. 41.